



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 10/567,134 | 02/06/2006 | Masahiko Igarashi | 025416-00026 | 4553 |
| 4372 | 7590 | 11/15/2010 | | |
| ARENT FOX LLP 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20036 | | | EXAMINER MACARTHUR, VICTOR L | |
| | | | ART UNIT 3679 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE 11/15/2010 | DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DCIPDocket@arentfox.com
IPMatters@arentfox.com
Patent_Mail@arentfox.com

| | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/567,134 | | IGARASHI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | | Art Unit | |
| | VICTOR MACARTHUR | | 3679 | |

All Participants:

(1) VICTOR MACARTHUR

(2) William Doyle

Date of Interview: 8 November 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Rejections of record

Claims discussed:

All

Prior art documents discussed:

Art of record

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

/Victor MacArthur/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3679

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner stated that it remains unclear what is being shown in figure 1. Is the gear prevented from further movement on the shaft in the installation direction by abutment, press fit, or some other means, or is the gear free for further sliding in the installation direction? The examiner reiterated that the claims would be rendered allowable over the prior art by claiming that the hub/gear is prevented from further axial movement IN THE INSTALLATION DIRECTION with respect to the shaft. However, the written description would still have to be amended to clarify how that is shown in the figures without new matter. Is the hub 14 shown installed as far back in the installation direction as it will go or is it free to slide further? Namely, does the rear face of 14 abut the back of the spline grooves of 12? Is it limited by other means such as press fit between 14 and 12 which prevents further intallation movement, or is 14 free to slide further on 12? Note that the written description regarding element 13 being a lock ring which prevents REMOVAL of 14 from 12 in the REMOVAL DIRECTION does not address the issue of whether 14 is free to move on 12 in the INSTALLATION DIRECTION further than what is shown in figure 1. It is important to clarify for the record whether the claimed limitations are at a position fully installed in the installation direction (i.e., prevented from further movement by abutment, press fit, etc.) or if the claim is at a position where further intallation direction movement is possible, since the later scenario is present in the prior art as set forth in the previous Office Action rejection. In short, the following must be established for the record: In figures 1, 3-5, 15-17, 23-25, 33-38, is hub 14 prevented from further movement in the INSTALLATION DIRECTION and if so by what? Again noting that the ring described with regard to element 13 is for preventing removal in the removal direction and appears to have no feature to prevent further movement from what is shown in the figures in the INSTALLATION DIRECTION.

Applicant's representative stated that he would consult with applicant regarding these issues. .